

*BS  
CONCL.*

particular category is selected on the computer and downloaded to the electronic camera via the cable interface.

#### REMARKS

Claims 15, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicated that the claims previously included the phrase "host processor" which was used to refer to the external computer. The word computer was added to independent claims, thus the Examiner is unclear as to whether there are two external computers or only 1.

By this amendment, claims 15, 27 and 28 have been amended to make the terminology consistent. Accordingly, these changes should remove the rejection of claims 15, 27 and 28 under U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim 32 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicated that claim 32 depends from a canceled claim.

By this amendment, claim 32 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is now moot.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 15, 29-31, 33-35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamada et al. (Japanese Laid-Open Patent Application No. Hei-5-344460).

With respect to independent claims 1, 29 and 30, the Examiner states that Yamada et al. disclose an electronic still camera connected to a reproduction unit comprising means responsive to the computer initiated request for transferring the image files corresponding to at least one particular category of the plurality of categories (via CPU) to the reproduction unit. The Examiner further states that since the reproduction unit is able to take a user specified categories/classifications and correlate with image data stored in the storage

medium, it is a computer.

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 15, 29-31, 33-35 and 37 are believed to be patentable over Yamada et al. By this amendment, independent claims 1, 29 and 30 have been changed to more clearly set forth the present invention. As amended, claims 1, 29 and 30 particularly point out that the electronic camera provides the captured images to an external computer in response to a computer initiated request, and that the electronic camera is interconnected to the external computer via a cable interface. Further, as set forth in amended claims 1 and 29, the electronic camera includes means responsive to the computer initiated request for transferring the image file(s) corresponding to at least one particular category of the plurality of categories to the external computer via the cable interface. Likewise, the method of amended claim 30 includes transferring, in response to the computer initiated request, the image files corresponding to at least one particular category to the external computer via the cable interface.

Yamada et al. has been carefully reviewed, and reference to these features as set forth in amended claims 1, 29 and 30 cannot be found. Specifically, Yamada et al. fail to disclose or suggest an electronic camera for providing captured images to an external computer in response to a computer initiated request, wherein the electronic camera is interconnected to the external computer via a cable interface. Yamada et al. also fail to disclose or suggest an electronic camera including means responsive to the computer initiated request for transferring the image file(s) corresponding to at least one particular category of the plurality of categories to the external computer via the cable interface.

Yamada et al. is directed to an electronic camera which is capable of recording images and designating corresponding classification codes, as well as reproducing images corresponding to the designated classification codes. The image files in the Yamada et al. camera which correspond to a particular classification code are transferred via a CPU to a reproduction unit internal to the electronic camera. Thus, such communication takes place completely within the electronic camera of Yamada et al. Yamada et al. do not disclose or suggest the use of an interconnection cable to connect the electronic camera to a separate

external computer. Further, Yamada et al. do not disclose or suggest communicating categories over a cable interface between an electronic camera and an external computer as set forth in amended claims 1, 29 and 30.

It should be pointed out that in an alternative embodiment, Yamada et al. does disclose an electronic camera wherein only the photographing system circuit is mounted on the electronic camera and that a separate apparatus is used for both the classifying and reproducing operations. This embodiment is described as using a removable memory such as a floppy disk. It is appropriate to assume that the floppy disk is used to record images in the electronic camera, and that the floppy disk is then transferred to the separate reproducing apparatus to perform the classifying and reproducing operations. Thus, the electronic camera of this alternative embodiment does not perform any classification functions whatsoever, and therefore, does not include the features set forth in amended claims 1, 29 and 30 including a processor for assigning the plurality of categories to the images captured by the image sensor, and control means for selecting one or more categories for the images. Accordingly, it is submitted that the invention of amended claims 1, 29 and 30 distinguishes over Yamada et al., and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are believed to be patentable over the prior art for at least the reasons discussed above.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 10-14 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al. in view of Yoshida (U.S. Patent No. 5,515,101).

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 10-14 and 26-17 depend on amended claim 1 and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended claim 1.

Claims 28, 36, 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada et al.

Claims 28 and 36 depend on amended claim 1, and claim 38 depends on amended claim 29. Claims 28, 36 and 38 are believed to be

patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to amended claims 1 and 29.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Pamela R. Crocker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 42,447

Pamela R. Crocker/phw  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (716) 477-0553  
Facsimile: (716) 477-4646